

Numerical Evidence that the Perturbation Expansion for a Non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$ -Symmetric Hamiltonian is Stieltjes

Carl M. Bender

Department of Physics, Washington University
St. Louis MO 63130, USA
cmb@howdy.wustl.edu

Ernst Joachim Weniger

Institut für Physikalische und Theoretische Chemie
Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany
joachim.weniger@chemie.uni-regensburg.de

Submitted to Journal of Mathematical Physics
2 October 2000

Abstract

Recently, several studies of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians having $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry have been conducted. Most striking about these complex Hamiltonians is how closely their properties resemble those of conventional Hermitian Hamiltonians. This paper presents further evidence of the similarity of these Hamiltonians to Hermitian Hamiltonians by examining the summation of the divergent weak-coupling perturbation series for the ground-state energy of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian $H = p^2 + \frac{1}{4}x^2 + i\lambda x^3$ recently studied by Bender and Dunne. For this purpose the first 193 (nonzero) coefficients of the Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation series in powers of λ^2 for the ground-state energy were calculated. Padé-summation and Padé-prediction techniques recently described by Weniger are applied to this perturbation series. The qualitative features of the results obtained in this way are indistinguishable from those obtained in the case of the perturbation series for the quartic anharmonic oscillator, which is known to be a Stieltjes series.

1 Introduction

Hamiltonians describing fundamental interactions traditionally possess two symmetries, the continuous symmetry of the proper Lorentz group and the discrete symmetry of Hermiticity. Lorentz invariance is a physical requirement. Hermiticity is a useful mathematical constraint that guarantees that the spectrum is real, although recent work shows that Hermiticity is only a sufficient condition and is not necessary for the reality of eigenvalues. From the assumptions of Lorentz invariance and positivity of the spectrum of the Hamiltonian one can prove the $\mathcal{PCT}$ theorem and thereby establish the physical symmetry of $\mathcal{PCT}$ invariance.

What happens if we impose only the more physical symmetries of Lorentz invariance and $\mathcal{PCT}$ invariance when we construct a Hamiltonian? The constraint of $\mathcal{PCT}$ invariance is weaker than Hermiticity, so Hamiltonians having this property need not be Hermitian. While it has not been proved, there is compelling analytical and numerical evidence supporting the

conjecture that, except when $\mathcal{PCT}$ symmetry is spontaneously broken, the energy levels of such Hamiltonians are all real and positive [1,2]. The reality and positivity of the spectrum is apparently a consequence of the $\mathcal{PCT}$ symmetry of H .

Many examples of $\mathcal{PCT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians in quantum field theory have been studied [3–8]. In quantum mechanics, where the $\mathcal{C}$ operator is unity, many examples of $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians have also been studied [9–19]. A simple example of such a quantum-mechanical Hamiltonian is $H = p^2 + ix^3$. Hamiltonians such as this may be regarded as *complex deformations* of conventional Hermitian Hamiltonians. To understand this deformation we consider the Hamiltonian

$$H = p^2 - (ix)^{2+\epsilon},$$

where $\epsilon \geq 0$. When $\epsilon = 0$, we have the conventional harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian, whose spectrum is real and positive. As ϵ increases from 0, the entire spectrum of the Hamiltonian smoothly deforms as a function of ϵ and remains real and positive for all positive values of ϵ . Thus, these theories are in effect the analytic continuation of conventional quantum mechanics into the complex plane.

These non-Hermitian theories exhibit some remarkable properties. Most interesting is that the expectation value of the operator x in quantum mechanics (and of the field ϕ in quantum field theory) is *nonzero* when $\epsilon > 0$. This is true even for the $p^2 - x^4$ Hamiltonian that one obtains at $\epsilon = 2$ and it is also true for the $-g\phi^4$ scalar quantum field theory. The $-g\phi^4$ quantum field theory is particularly surprising because it has a positive real spectrum and exhibits a nonzero value of $\langle \phi \rangle$. In four-dimensional space-time it has a dimensionless coupling constant, is renormalizable, and is asymptotically free (and thus nontrivial). It may thus provide a useful setting to describe the Higgs particle [7].

We are struck by the close similarity between the properties of non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric quantum-mechanical Hamiltonians and conventional Hermitian Hamiltonians. Moreover, in mathematical terms, we are struck by the strong resemblance between self-adjoint Sturm-Liouville problems and these new complex Sturm-Liouville problems. The purpose of this paper is to present further evidence of this strong similarity by investigating various aspects of Padé summation and Padé prediction of the Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation series for the ground-state energy of the complex $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian

$$H(\lambda) = p^2 + \frac{1}{4}x^2 + i\lambda x^3. \quad (1)$$

Note that this Hamiltonian is $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetric because under parity reflection $\mathcal{P} : p \rightarrow -p$ and $\mathcal{P} : x \rightarrow -x$ and under time reversal, which is an antiunitary operation, $\mathcal{T} : p \rightarrow -p$, $\mathcal{T} : x \rightarrow x$, and $\mathcal{T} : i \rightarrow -i$.

The large-order behavior of the divergent Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation series

$$E_0(\lambda) \sim \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \lambda^{2n} \quad (\lambda \rightarrow 0^+), \quad (2)$$

for the ground-state energy eigenvalue of the Hamiltonian in (1) has already been examined in [20], where the first 46 terms of the perturbation expansion had been generated using recursion formulas. It was observed there that the coefficients b_n are all integers, that they alternate in sign, and that their magnitude grows rapidly with n . The first 10 coefficients are listed in Table 1.

To calculate the coefficients b_n we make the *ansatz* that the wave function is a formal series in powers of the coupling constant λ and that the coefficient of λ^n has the form of a Gaussian $\exp(-x^2/4)$ times a polynomial of degree $3n$ in the variable x . The eigenvalue $E_0(\lambda)$ automatically appears as a series in powers of λ^2 . Thus, for each additional coefficient in the series for E_0 it is necessary to calculate *two* orders in powers of λ for the wave function.

Table 1: The first 10 coefficients b_n in the perturbation expansion (2) for the ground state energy of the complex $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1).

n	b_n
1	11
2	-930
3	158836
4	-38501610
5	11777967516
6	-4300048271460
7	1815215203378344
8	-868277986898581530
9	464025598165231889260
10	-274145574452876905074540

In [20] it was pointed out that the Hamiltonian (1) describes a $0+1$ dimensional ϕ^3 field theory and that ϕ^3 theories were the first quantum field theories in which the divergences of perturbation theory were studied [21]. Using the standard methods for determining the large-order behavior of perturbation theory [22, 23] it can be shown that the leading large- n behavior of the coefficients b_n is given by the formula

$$b_n = (-1)^{n+1} 60^{n+1/2} (2\pi)^{-3/2} \Gamma(n+1/2) [1 + O(1/n)] \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (3)$$

This asymptotic behavior was verified numerically in [20]. There, it was also shown that the first correction term to this leading asymptotic behavior, which is proportional to $1/n$, is negative. Although divergent, the series in (2) is Borel summable [24–27]. If the factor of i were absent from the Hamiltonian (1), then the perturbation coefficients b_n would not alternate in sign and the perturbation series would not be Borel summable.

It is interesting that to derive the asymptotic formula in (3) one must use dispersion-relation techniques that rely on crucial assumptions about the analyticity of the function $E_0(\lambda)$. These assumptions are justified for the Hermitian Hamiltonian of the anharmonic oscillator [28, 29],

$$\mathcal{H}(\beta) = p^2 + x^2 + \beta x^4. \quad (4)$$

However, the validity of these assumptions is unproved for the non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric λx^3 oscillator.

The eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}(\beta)$ of the quartic anharmonic oscillator possess several other properties which closely resemble those of the eigenvalues $E(\lambda)$ of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1). For example, the ground-state energy eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ of the quartic anharmonic oscillator possesses a divergent weak-coupling perturbation expansion, which also diverges factorially [22, 30]:

$$\mathcal{E}_0(\beta) \sim 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_n \beta^n \quad (\beta \rightarrow 0^+), \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_n = (-1)^{n+1} \frac{4}{\pi^{3/2}} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{n+1/2} \Gamma(n+1/2) [1 + O(1/n)] \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (6)$$

A comparison of the large-order asymptotics (3) and (6) shows that the two perturbation expansions (2) and (5) possess the same rate of divergence if we choose

$$\beta = 40\lambda^2. \quad (7)$$

In view of these striking similarities between the ground-state eigenvalues $E_0(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ it should be interesting to investigate what other similarities do exist. In particular, we are interested in similarities that could provide evidence that the Padé summation of the divergent perturbation series (2) for the ground-state energy of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1) converges.

In the case of the ground-state energy shift $\Delta\mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ of the quartic anharmonic oscillator, which is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_0(\beta) = 1 + \beta\Delta\mathcal{E}_0(\beta), \quad (8)$$

it was shown rigorously by Simon (Theorem IV.2.1 of [28]) that the corresponding perturbation series is a Stieltjes series. This has some far-reaching consequences. In the case of Stieltjes series, Padé approximants possess a highly developed convergence theory, as we discuss in detail in Section 2. In particular, the Stieltjes nature of the perturbation series (5) guarantees that certain subsequences of the Padé table converge to a uniquely determined Stieltjes function.

Although we cannot prove it rigorously, we believe that for the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1) the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ defined by

$$E_0(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} + \lambda^2 \Delta E_0(\lambda^2), \quad (9)$$

in which E_0 is considered as a function of λ^2 , is also a Stieltjes function. This implies that the corresponding perturbation series is a Stieltjes series.

It is the intention of this article to provide numerical evidence supporting this conjecture. We do this by comparing Padé summations and Padé predictions (see [31] and references therein) of the perturbation expansions for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ and for the analogous ground-state energy shift $\Delta\mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ of the quartic anharmonic oscillator.

Here, one might argue that one should also investigate the summation of the perturbation expansion for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ with the help of the sequence transformations that were described in Section 7 and 8 of [32] and which produced very good results in the case of the anharmonic oscillators [30, 33, 34]. However, the convergence theory of these sequence transformations, which in the case of power series also produce rational approximants, is still very much in its infancy and no theoretical results concerning the transformation of Stieltjes series are known so far. Consequently, we would only produce numbers without gaining any further mathematical insight.

In Section 2, we present the relevant details of Padé approximants, the computation of Padé approximants by means of Wynn's recursive epsilon algorithm [35], and we discuss Stieltjes series and their associated Stieltjes functions. In Section 3, we show that the Padé summation of the perturbation expansions for $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ and $\Delta\mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$, respectively, produces results of identical quality if the two coupling constants λ and β satisfy (7). In Section 4, we discuss the prediction of unknown perturbation coefficients with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm, and we show that the coefficients of the perturbation expansions for either $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ or $\Delta\mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ can be predicted equally well. Finally, in Section 5 we give a brief summary.

2 Padé Approximants, Wynn's Epsilon Algorithm, and Stieltjes Series

In recent years, Padé approximants have become the standard tool in theoretical physics to overcome problems with slowly convergent or divergent power series. Accordingly, there is a vast literature on the mathematical properties of Padé approximants as well as on their applications in theoretical physics. Any attempt to provide a reasonably complete bibliography would be beyond the scope of this article (see for example the extensive bibliography compiled by Brezinski [36]). We just mention that the popularity of Padé approximants in theoretical physics can be traced back to a review by Baker [37], that the first specialized monograph on Padé approximants is due to Baker [38], and that currently the most complete source of information is the second edition of the monograph by Baker and Graves-Morris [39]. In addition to treatments in more mathematically oriented books on continued fractions and related topics [40–43], Padé approximants are also discussed in book on mathematical and theoretical physics, for example in Section 8 of the book by Bender and Orszag [26], or in Part III of a book by Baker on critical phenomena [44]. Then, there is a book by Pozzi [45] on the use of Padé approximants in fluid dynamics. Finally, there is even a monograph [46] and two articles [47, 48] on the history of Padé approximants and related topics.

A Padé approximant $P_m^l(z)$ to a function f possessing a (formal) power series expansion

$$f(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{\nu} z^{\nu}, \quad (10)$$

which may converge or diverge, is the ratio of two polynomials $A_l(z)$ and $B_m(z)$ of degrees l and m in z (p. 383 of [26]):

$$P_m^l(z) = \frac{A_l(z)}{B_m(z)} = \frac{a_0 + a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + \dots + a_l z^l}{1 + b_1 z + b_2 z^2 + \dots + b_m z^m}. \quad (11)$$

An alternative notation for Padé approximants, which is used in the books by Baker and Graves-Morris [38, 39], is $P_m^l(z) = [l/m]_f(z)$. This notation is usually simplified further to $P_m^l(z) = [l/m]$ if explicit references to f and z are not necessary.

The coefficients a_{λ} and b_{μ} of the polynomials $A_l(z)$ and $B_m(z)$ in (11) are chosen in such a way that the Taylor expansion of $f(z)$ and of its Padé approximant agree as far as possible:

$$f(z) - P_m^l(z) = O(z^{l+m+1}) \quad (z \rightarrow 0). \quad (12)$$

This asymptotic error estimate leads to a system of linear equations by means of which the coefficients $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_l$ and $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m$ in (11) can be computed [38, 39]. Moreover, several algorithms are known which permit a recursive computation of Padé approximants. A discussion of the merits and weaknesses of the various computational schemes can for instance be found in Section II.3 of the book by Cuyt and Wuytack [49].

Probably, the best known recursive algorithm for Padé approximants is Wynn's epsilon algorithm [35]:

$$\varepsilon_{-1}^{(n)} = 0, \quad \varepsilon_0^{(n)} = s_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (13a)$$

$$\varepsilon_{k+1}^{(n)} = \varepsilon_{k-1}^{(n+1)} + 1/[\varepsilon_k^{(n+1)} - \varepsilon_k^{(n)}], \quad k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (13b)$$

A compact FORTRAN program for the epsilon algorithm as well as the underlying computational algorithm is described in Section 4.3 of [32].

If the input data $\varepsilon_0^{(n)} = s_n$ of Wynn's epsilon algorithm are the partial sums

$$f_n(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n \gamma_\nu z^\nu \quad (14)$$

of the formal power series (10) according to $\varepsilon_0^{(n)} = f_n(z)$, then the elements $\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)}$ with *even* subscripts are Padé approximants to $f(z)$ according to [35]

$$\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)} = P_k^{k+n}(z). \quad (15)$$

The elements $\varepsilon_{2k+1}^{(n)}$ with *odd* subscripts are only auxiliary quantities, which diverge if the whole transformation process converges.

The epsilon algorithm is a useful numerical algorithm that is applied successfully in a large variety of different fields. Accordingly, there is an extensive literature dealing with it. A fairly complete coverage of the older literature can be found in a book by Brezinski [50]. It may be interesting to note that the epsilon algorithm is not restricted to scalar sequences but can be generalized to cover vector sequences. A recent review of these developments can be found in [51].

If one tries to sum a divergent power series by converting its partial sums (14) to Padé approximants, it is usually a good idea to use *diagonal* Padé approximants, whose numerator and denominator polynomials have equal degrees. If this is not possible one should use Padé approximants with numerator and denominator polynomials whose degrees differ as little as possible. If we use the epsilon algorithm for the computation of the Padé approximants, then (15) implies that we should use the elements of following staircase sequence in the Padé table as approximations to $f(z)$ (see Eq. (4.3-7) of [32]):

$$P_0^0(z), P_0^1(z), P_1^1(z), \dots, P_\nu^\nu(z), P_{\nu+1}^{\nu+1}(z), P_{\nu+1}^{\nu+1}(z), \dots \quad (16)$$

This staircase sequence exploits the available information optimally if the partial sums $f_n(z)$ with $n \geq 0$ are computed successively and if, after the computation of each new partial sum, the element of the epsilon table with the highest possible *even* subscript is computed. With the help of the notation $\llbracket x \rrbracket$ for the integral part of x , this staircase sequence can be written compactly as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{(n-2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket)} = P_{\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{n-\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}(z) \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots). \quad (17)$$

As remarked above, Padé approximants are now used almost routinely to overcome problems with slowly convergent or divergent power series. Hence, their practical usefulness is beyond question. However, from a theoretical point of view, the situation is not so good. So far, a completely satisfactory *general* convergence theory of Padé approximants for essentially arbitrary power series does not exist.

Nevertheless, there is a special class of series, the so-called *Stieltjes* series, which possess a highly developed and elegant convergence theory. In this section we will only discuss those properties of Stieltjes series and Stieltjes functions that are needed to provide numerical evidence that the perturbation expansion for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ of the complex $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1), considered as a function of λ^2 , is a Stieltjes series. Detailed discussions of the properties of Stieltjes series and their special role in the theory of Padé approximants can be found in Section 8.6 of [26] or in Section 5 of [39].

A function $F(z)$ with $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is called a *Stieltjes* function if it can be expressed as a Stieltjes integral according to

$$F(z) = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\Phi(t)}{1+zt} \quad [|\arg(z)| < \pi]. \quad (18)$$

Here, $\Phi(t)$ is a bounded, nondecreasing function taking infinitely many different values on $0 \leq t < \infty$. Moreover, the moment integrals

$$\mu_n = \int_0^\infty t^n d\Phi(t) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0) \quad (19)$$

must be real and finite for all finite values of n . A Stieltjes function can be expressed by its corresponding *Stieltjes* series:

$$F(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} (-1)^\nu \mu_\nu z^\nu. \quad (20)$$

Whether this series converges or diverges depends on the behavior of the Stieltjes moments μ_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In a typical Stieltjes summation problem, as it occurs in the context of divergent perturbation expansion, only the numerical values of a finite number of Stieltjes moments μ_n are known. Thus, one has to find a way of constructing an approximation to the unknown Stieltjes function $F(z)$ from a finite string of moments.

Of course, one would also like to have some theoretical evidence that $F(z)$ exists and is uniquely determined by the Stieltjes moments $\{\mu_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. Many necessary and sufficient conditions that guarantee this are known in literature. Unfortunately, it is by no means easy to apply them. For example, a necessary condition that the series (20) is indeed a Stieltjes series is that the Hankel determinants

$$D(m, n) = \begin{vmatrix} \mu_m & \mu_{m+1} & \cdots & \mu_{m+n} \\ \mu_{m+1} & \mu_{m+2} & \cdots & \mu_{m+n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mu_{m+n} & \mu_{m+n+1} & \cdots & \mu_{m+2n} \end{vmatrix} \quad (21)$$

are positive for all $m, n \geq 0$ (see Theorem 5.1.2 on p. 197 of [39]).

Then, there is a sufficient criterion, the so-called Carleman condition (see p. 410 of [26] or pp. 239 - 240 of [39]), which requires that the series $\sum_{j=1}^\infty (\mu_j)^{-1/(2j)}$ diverges and thus limits the admissible growth of the moments μ_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$ [52]. If the condition $D(m, n) > 0$ on the determinants as well as the Carleman condition are both satisfied, then the Padé approximants $P_m^{m+j}(z)$ constructed from the partial sums of the moment expansion (20) converge for every $j \geq -1$ to the corresponding Stieltjes function $F(z)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ (see for example Theorem 5.5.1 on p. 240 of [39]).

If only a finite number of moments are known, it is impossible to prove that $D(m, n) > 0$ holds for all $m, n \geq 0$, and it is also not possible to prove rigorously that the Carleman condition is satisfied, although we would like to emphasize that the large-order formula (3), which was verified numerically in [20], is in agreement with the Carleman condition.

Therefore, we prefer an indirect approach in order to provide evidence that the perturbation series for the energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1) is indeed a Stieltjes series. For that purpose, let us assume that the moment expansion (20), whose Stieltjes nature we want to establish, is a Stieltjes series. Padé approximants to Stieltjes series possess a highly developed convergence theory, and many conditions and inequalities are known that Padé approximants to a Stieltjes series must satisfy. For example, Padé approximants constructed from the partial sums

$$F_n(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n (-1)^\nu \mu_\nu z^\nu \quad (22)$$

of the moment expansion (20) for a Stieltjes function $F(z)$ satisfy for $z > 0$ the following inequalities (Theorem 15.2 on p. 215 of [38]):

$$(-1)^{j+1} \left\{ P_{m+1}^{m+j+1}(z) - P_m^{m+j}(z) \right\} \geq 0, \quad (23)$$

$$(-1)^{j+1} \left\{ P_m^{m+j}(z) - P_{m-1}^{m+j+1}(z) \right\} \geq 0, \quad (24)$$

$$P_m^m(z) \geq F(z) \geq P_m^{m-1}(z). \quad (25)$$

It follows from inequality (23) that the Padé sequence $\{P_m^{m+j}(z)\}_{m=0}^\infty$ is *increasing* for $z > 0$ if j is *odd*, and it is *decreasing* if j is *even*. Moreover, if we set $j = -1$ in (24) and replace m by $m + 1$, we obtain the inequality

$$P_{m+1}^m(z) \geq P_m^{m+1}(z) \quad (m \in \mathbb{N}_0). \quad (26)$$

Thus, if we use Wynn's epsilon algorithm (13) to convert the partial sums (22) to Padé approximants and choose the approximants to $F(z)$ according to (17), then it follows from inequalities (25) and (26) that these Padé approximants satisfy the following inequality if the moment expansion (20) for $F(z)$ is a Stieltjes series:

$$P_m^{m+1}(z) \leq F(z) \leq P_{m+1}^{m+1}(z) \quad (z > 0, m \in \mathbb{N}_0). \quad (27)$$

Thus, the approximants (17) produced by Wynn's epsilon algorithm yield for $z > 0$ two nesting sequences $P_m^{m+1}(z) = \varepsilon_{2m}^{(1)}$ and $P_{m+1}^{m+1}(z) = \varepsilon_{2m+2}^{(0)}$ of lower and upper bounds to $F(z)$ if the the moment expansion (20) is a Stieltjes series.

If only the numerical values of a finite number of Stieltjes moments are available, then it is of course not possible to prove rigorously that the series under consideration is a Stieltjes series. Nevertheless, we can provide considerable evidence that this hypothesis is true if inequality (27) is valid in all cases that can be checked.

3 Summation Results

In this section we want to show that the Padé summation of the perturbation expansion

$$\Delta E_0(\lambda^2) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} b_{\nu+1} \lambda^{2\nu} \quad (28)$$

for the ground-state energy shift of the of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1) and of the perturbation expansion

$$\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_{\nu+1} \beta^\nu \quad (29)$$

for the ground-state energy shift of the quartic anharmonic oscillator yield results of virtually identical quality if the two coupling constants λ and β satisfy (7). Moreover, we want to demonstrate numerically that inequality (27), which is satisfied in the case of the Padé summation a Stieltjes series, is apparently also satisfied. In our summation calculations, we used all coefficients b_ν and $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ with $0 \leq \nu \leq 193$ which had been computed recursively.

In this article, we compute all Padé approximants with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm (13). Thus, the partial sums

$$s_n(\lambda^2) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n b_{\nu+1} \lambda^{2\nu} \quad (30)$$

and

$$\sigma_n(\beta) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n \mathcal{B}_{\nu+1} \beta^\nu \quad (31)$$

are used as input data for Wynn's epsilon algorithm according to $\varepsilon_0^{(n)} = s_n(\lambda^2)$ or $\varepsilon_0^{(n)} = \sigma_n(\beta)$, respectively, and the approximations to the energy shifts are chosen according to (17).

Table 2: Padé summation of the perturbation expansions (28) and (29) for the ground-state energy shifts $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ and $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ with $\lambda = 1/7$ and $\beta = 40/49$, respectively.

n	$s_n(\lambda^2)$	$\sigma_n(\beta)$	$P_{\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{n-\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}(\lambda^2)$	$P_{\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{n-\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}(\beta)$
0	$0.110 \cdot 10^{002}$	$0.750 \cdot 10^{000}$	11.00 000 000 000 000	0.750 000 000 000 000
1	$-0.798 \cdot 10^{001}$	$-0.321 \cdot 10^{000}$	-7.97 959 183 673 469	-0.321 428 571 428 571
2	$0.582 \cdot 10^{002}$	$0.315 \cdot 10^{001}$	6.76 871 520 405 468	0.497 075 017 205 781
3	$-0.269 \cdot 10^{003}$	$-0.133 \cdot 10^{002}$	3.14 452 476 154 168	0.283 471 705 042 096
4	$0.177 \cdot 10^{004}$	$0.861 \cdot 10^{002}$	5.92 770 890 838 469	0.444 962 648 249 413
5	$-0.134 \cdot 10^{005}$	$-0.639 \cdot 10^{003}$	4.84 920 642 167 536	0.379 736 282 027 717
50	$0.153 \cdot 10^{072}$	$0.684 \cdot 10^{070}$	5.52 416 958 165 793	0.419 249 574 461 710
51	$-0.964 \cdot 10^{073}$	$-0.432 \cdot 10^{072}$	5.52 416 451 428 038	0.419 249 241 261 250
52	$0.620 \cdot 10^{075}$	$0.278 \cdot 10^{074}$	5.52 416 888 260 688	0.419 249 527 748 761
53	$-0.407 \cdot 10^{077}$	$-0.182 \cdot 10^{076}$	5.52 416 531 636 255	0.419 249 293 076 390
54	$0.272 \cdot 10^{079}$	$0.122 \cdot 10^{078}$	5.52 416 839 738 891	0.419 249 495 310 895
101	$-0.210 \cdot 10^{172}$	$-0.939 \cdot 10^{170}$	5.52 416 721 141 847	0.419 249 415 925 473
102	$0.263 \cdot 10^{174}$	$0.118 \cdot 10^{173}$	5.52 416 721 422 990	0.419 249 416 112 202
103	$-0.334 \cdot 10^{176}$	$-0.149 \cdot 10^{175}$	5.52 416 721 178 460	0.419 249 415 949 529
104	$0.427 \cdot 10^{178}$	$0.191 \cdot 10^{177}$	5.52 416 721 397 212	0.419 249 416 094 862
105	$-0.552 \cdot 10^{180}$	$-0.247 \cdot 10^{179}$	5.52 416 721 206 667	0.419 249 415 968 069
150	$0.318 \cdot 10^{279}$	$0.142 \cdot 10^{278}$	5.52 416 721 306 531	0.419 249 416 033 824
151	$-0.590 \cdot 10^{281}$	$-0.264 \cdot 10^{280}$	5.52 416 721 305 477	0.419 249 416 033 119
152	$0.110 \cdot 10^{284}$	$0.493 \cdot 10^{282}$	5.52 416 721 306 436	0.419 249 416 033 760
153	$-0.207 \cdot 10^{286}$	$-0.928 \cdot 10^{284}$	5.52 416 721 305 579	0.419 249 416 033 187
154	$0.392 \cdot 10^{288}$	$0.175 \cdot 10^{287}$	5.52 416 721 306 359	0.419 249 416 033 708
188	$0.371 \cdot 10^{367}$	$0.166 \cdot 10^{366}$	5.52 416 721 306 035	0.419 249 416 033 489
189	$-0.860 \cdot 10^{369}$	$-0.385 \cdot 10^{368}$	5.52 416 721 306 009	0.419 249 416 033 472
190	$0.201 \cdot 10^{372}$	$0.898 \cdot 10^{370}$	5.52 416 721 306 033	0.419 249 416 033 488
191	$-0.471 \cdot 10^{374}$	$-0.211 \cdot 10^{373}$	5.52 416 721 306 011	0.419 249 416 033 474
192	$0.111 \cdot 10^{377}$	$0.496 \cdot 10^{375}$	5.52 416 721 306 031	0.419 249 416 033 487

In Table 2 we present illustrative results of the Padé summation of the perturbation expansion (28) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ with $\lambda = 1/7$ and of the perturbation expansion (29) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ with $\beta = 40/49$. Thus, the two coupling constants λ and β satisfy (7). This implies that the two perturbation expansions, whose partial sums are displayed in columns 2 and 3, should show the same rate of divergence.

Here, we must remember that the larger-order estimates (3) and (6), respectively, imply that the partial sums (30) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1) are for all $n \geq 0$ at least one order of magnitude greater than the partial sums (31) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ of the quartic anharmonic oscillator. Otherwise, the observed rates of divergence in columns 2 and 3 are virtually identical.

Moreover, the Padé approximants in columns 4 and 5 apparently satisfy the inequality (27), which holds if the series to be transformed is a Stieltjes series. If the index n in column 1 is even ($n = 2m$), then the diagonal Padé approximants $P_m^m(\lambda^2)$ and $P_m^m(\beta)$ provide upper bounds that strictly decrease with increasing m and, if n is odd ($n = 2m + 1$), then the Padé approximants $P_m^{m+1}(\lambda^2)$ and $P_m^{m+1}(\beta)$ provide lower bounds that strictly increase with increasing m .

We have done analogous summation calculations also for many other values of the coupling constants λ and β . Of course, the performance of the Padé summations depend very much on the size of the coupling constants. For smaller values of λ and the corresponding β , convergence is better than in Table 2, whereas for $\lambda = 1$ and $\beta = 40$ only the first digit of the summation results stabilize. For larger values of λ and β , Padé summation produces only relatively crude upper and lower bounds. However, to emphasize that the typical qualitative features of the summation results in Table 2 – the same rate of divergence of two perturbation series and the occurrence of strictly decreasing upper bounds P_m^m and strictly increasing lower bounds P_m^{m+1} – were consistently observed in all cases considered.

Thus, Wynn's epsilon algorithm is apparently unable to detect any substantial difference between the perturbation series (29) for $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$, whose Stieltjes nature was established rigorously by Simon (Theorem IV.2.1 of [28]), and the perturbation series (28) for $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$, whose Stieltjes nature we conjecture.

4 Padé Predictions

As shown by countless articles from all branches of physics, Padé approximants have become the standard tool to overcome problems with slowly convergent or divergent power series. However, Padé approximants have other useful features that are not as well known yet. For example, Padé approximants can be used to make predictions for higher-order series coefficients that were not used for the construction of the approximant.

On a heuristic level the prediction capability of Padé approximants, which was apparently first noted and used by Gilewicz [53], can be explained quite easily. Let us assume that the partial sums (14) of the power series for some function $f(z)$ are to be converted to Padé approximants. Then, the *accuracy-through-order* relationship (12) implies that a Padé approximant $P_m^l(z)$ to $f(z)$ can be expressed as the partial sum $f_{l+m}(z)$ from which it was constructed plus a term $z^{l+m+1}\mathcal{R}_m^l(z)$, which was generated by the transformation of the partial sum to the rational approximant:

$$P_m^l(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{l+m} \gamma_\nu z^\nu + z^{l+m+1} \mathcal{R}_m^l(z) = f_{l+m}(z) + z^{l+m+1} \mathcal{R}_m^l(z). \quad (32)$$

Similarly, the power series (10) can be expressed as follows:

$$f(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{l+m} \gamma_\nu z^\nu + z^{l+m+1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{l+m+\nu+1} z^\nu = f_{l+m}(z) + z^{l+m+1} \mathcal{F}_{l+m+1}(z). \quad (33)$$

Let us now assume that the indices l and m so large that the Padé approximant $P_m^l(z)$ provides a sufficiently accurate approximation to $f(z)$. Then, the Padé transformation

term $\mathcal{R}_m^l(z)$ must also provide a sufficiently accurate approximation to the truncation error $\mathcal{F}_{l+m+1}(z)$ of the power series. In general, we have no reason to assume that

$$\mathcal{R}_m^l(z) = \mathcal{F}_{l+m+1}(z) \quad (34)$$

might hold *exactly* for finite values of l and m . Consequently, Taylor expansions of $\mathcal{R}_m^l(z)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{l+m+1}(z)$, respectively, will in general produce different results. Nevertheless, the *leading* coefficients of the Taylor expansion for $\mathcal{R}_m^l(z)$ should in such a case provide sufficiently accurate approximations to the corresponding coefficients of the Taylor series for $\mathcal{F}_{l+m+1}(z)$.

It is important to note that this prediction capability of Padé approximants does not depend on the convergence of the power series expansions for $\mathcal{R}_m^l(z)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{l+m+1}(z)$, respectively, which was used implicitly in our heuristic reasoning given above. Padé approximants are able to make predictions about series coefficients even if the power series (10) for f as well as the power series expansions for $\mathcal{R}_m^l$ and $\mathcal{F}_{l+m+1}(z)$ are only asymptotic as $z \rightarrow 0$. This fact explains why the prediction capability of Padé approximants can be so very useful in the case of violently divergent perturbation expansions (see [31, 54–72] and references therein).

Theoretically, very little is known about the prediction of series coefficients that were not used for the construction of the Padé approximant. A notable exception are again Stieltjes series for which inequalities are known.

Let us assume that the partial sums (22) of the moment expansion for some Stieltjes function $F(z)$ are to be converted to Padé approximants. Such a Padé approximant $P_m^l(z)$ possesses the following power series expansion:

$$P_m^l(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} (-1)^\nu \mu_\nu^{[l/m]} z^\nu. \quad (35)$$

In Theorem 5.2.7 on p. 220 of [39] it was shown that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and for all $l \geq m - 1$ the coefficients $\mu_n^{[l/m]}$ in (35) are bounded in magnitude by the Stieltjes moments μ_n in (20) according to

$$0 \leq \mu_n^{[l/m]} \leq \mu_n. \quad (36)$$

This inequality can be used to analyze the Stieltjes nature of a moment expansion of the type of (20). With the help of computer algebra systems like Maple or Mathematica it is possible to construct Padé approximants $P_m^l(z)$ in an unspecified symbolic variable z , and this can even be done free of rounding errors if the coefficients of the series to be transformed are exact integers like the coefficients b_n in (2) or exact rational numbers like the coefficients $\mathcal{B}_n$ in (5). In the next step, a the leading part of a power series expansion of the Padé approximant must be constructed. The resulting series coefficients can then be compared with the corresponding coefficients of the moment expansion.

Again, this poses no principal problems for computer algebra systems like Maple and Mathematica. However, the accuracy-through-order relationship (12) implies that inequality (36), which is to be checked, is by default satisfied for all indices $n \leq l + m$, and only for $n \geq l + m + 1$ we obtain useful information about the Stieltjes nature of the moment expansion, from which the Padé approximant was constructed. Thus, if $l + m$ becomes large, the brute-force approach based on computer algebra systems becomes very demanding both with respect to computer time and memory because it requires both the symbolic construction of complicated Padé approximants and also symbolic differentiations of very high orders.

These computational problems can be simplified considerably with the help of a recently derived recursive scheme (Section 3 of [31]) that permits a direct calculation of the transformation term $\mathcal{R}_m^l(z)$ in (32) if the corresponding Padé approximant $P_m^l(z)$ can be computed

with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm according to (15); that is, for Padé approximants of the type $P_k^{k+n}(z)$ with $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

It follows from the accuracy-through-order relationship (12) in combination with (15) that $\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)}$ can be expressed as follows if the partial sums (14) of the power series for some function $f(z)$ are used as input data for Wynn's epsilon algorithm (13):

$$\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)} = f_{n+2k}(z) + z^{n+2k+1} \varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z). \quad (37)$$

The quantities $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ can be computed with the help of the recursive scheme in Eq. (3.15) of [31], which uses the coefficients γ_n of the power series (10) for $f(z)$ as input data, as follows:

$$\varphi_0^{(n)}(z) = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (38a)$$

$$\varphi_2^{(n)}(z) = \frac{[\gamma_{n+2}]^2}{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_{n+2}z}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (38b)$$

$$\varphi_{2k+2}^{(n)}(z) = \varphi_{2k}^{(n+2)}(z) + \frac{\alpha_{2k+2}^{(n)}(z)}{\beta_{2k+2}^{(n)}(z)}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (38c)$$

$$\alpha_{2k+2}^{(n)}(z) = \frac{\gamma_{n+2k+2} + \delta\varphi_{2k}^{(n+1)}(z)}{\gamma_{n+2k+1} + \delta\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)} - \frac{\gamma_{n+2k+2} + \delta\varphi_{2k}^{(n+1)}(z)}{\gamma_{n+2k+1} + z\varphi_{2k}^{(n+1)}(z) - \varphi_{2k-2}^{(n+2)}(z)}, \quad (38d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{2k+2}^{(n)}(z) &= \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+2k+2} + \delta\varphi_{2k}^{(n+1)}(z)} - \frac{z}{\gamma_{n+2k+1} + \delta\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)} \\ &+ \frac{z}{\gamma_{n+2k+1} + z\varphi_{2k}^{(n+1)}(z) - \varphi_{2k-2}^{(n+2)}(z)}, \end{aligned} \quad (38e)$$

where

$$\delta\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z) = z\varphi_{2k}^{(n+1)}(z) - \varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z). \quad (39)$$

The rational function $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ can be expressed as a power series in z according to

$$\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z) = g_0^{(n,2k)} + g_1^{(n,2k)}z + g_2^{(n,2k)}z^2 + \dots + g_\nu^{(n,2k)}z^\nu + \dots \quad (40)$$

The coefficients $g_\nu^{(n,2k)}$ of this series expansion can be used to predict the coefficients $\gamma_{n+2k+\nu+1}$ with $\nu \geq 0$ of the power series expansion (10) for $f(z)$ that were not used for the construction of either $\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)}$ or $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$.

Thus, we can compute the rational function $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}$ with the help of the recursive scheme (38) in the case of the perturbation series (28) for $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ and (29) for $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$. In the case of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric perturbation series we obtain the expansion

$$\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(\lambda^2) = b_0^{(n,2k)} + b_1^{(n,2k)}\lambda^2 + b_2^{(n,2k)}\lambda^4 + \dots + b_\nu^{(n,2k)}\lambda^{2\nu} + \dots, \quad (41)$$

and in the case of the perturbation series for the quartic anharmonic oscillator we obtain

$$\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(\beta) = \mathcal{B}_0^{(n,2k)} + \mathcal{B}_1^{(n,2k)}\beta + \mathcal{B}_2^{(n,2k)}\beta^2 + \dots + \mathcal{B}_\nu^{(n,2k)}\beta^\nu + \dots \quad (42)$$

The coefficients $b_\nu^{(n,2k)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_\nu^{(n,2k)}$ with $\nu \geq 0$ can be used to obtain predictions for the coefficients $b_{n+2k+\nu+2}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{n+2k+\nu+2}$, respectively, that were not used for the construction of the Padé approximants $\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)} = P_k^{k+n}$ or the transformation terms $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}$.

In Table 3 we compute the rational function $\varphi_{66}^{(0)}(\lambda^2)$ corresponding to the diagonal Padé approximant $\varepsilon_{66}^{(n)} = P_{33}^{33}(\lambda^2)$ with the help of the recursive scheme (38) from the coefficients b_ν with $1 \leq \nu \leq 67$. The resulting expansion coefficients $b_\nu^{(0,66)}$ defined in (41) with $\nu \geq 0$ provide predictions to the coefficients $b_{\nu+68}$ of the perturbation series (28). All calculations for Table 3 were done free of rounding errors using the exact rational arithmetics of Maple. Only in the final step the coefficients were converted to floating point numbers for the sake of readability.

Table 3: Predictions $b_n^{(0,66)}$ for the coefficients b_{n+68} of the perturbation series (28) for $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ with $0 \leq n \leq 15$.

n	$b_n^{(0,66)}$	b_{n+68}
0	$-0.118\ 625\ 502\ 281\ 564\ 111\ 353 \cdot 10^{217}$	$-0.118\ 625\ 502\ 281\ 564\ 111\ 358 \cdot 10^{217}$
1	$0.487\ 707\ 952\ 691\ 623\ 584\ 397 \cdot 10^{220}$	$0.487\ 707\ 952\ 691\ 623\ 585\ 158 \cdot 10^{220}$
2	$-0.203\ 437\ 822\ 070\ 101\ 216\ 978 \cdot 10^{224}$	$-0.203\ 437\ 822\ 070\ 101\ 222\ 504 \cdot 10^{224}$
3	$0.860\ 803\ 267\ 021\ 875\ 481\ 138 \cdot 10^{227}$	$0.860\ 803\ 267\ 021\ 875\ 756\ 369 \cdot 10^{227}$
4	$-0.369\ 393\ 498\ 548\ 727\ 222\ 559 \cdot 10^{231}$	$-0.369\ 393\ 498\ 548\ 728\ 279\ 960 \cdot 10^{231}$
5	$0.160\ 732\ 212\ 082\ 002\ 560\ 522 \cdot 10^{235}$	$0.160\ 732\ 212\ 082\ 005\ 901\ 209 \cdot 10^{235}$
6	$-0.709\ 026\ 471\ 212\ 486\ 114\ 145 \cdot 10^{238}$	$-0.709\ 026\ 471\ 212\ 576\ 489\ 701 \cdot 10^{238}$
7	$0.317\ 020\ 667\ 799\ 578\ 470\ 271 \cdot 10^{242}$	$0.317\ 020\ 667\ 799\ 793\ 728\ 631 \cdot 10^{242}$
8	$-0.143\ 648\ 198\ 373\ 426\ 854\ 924 \cdot 10^{246}$	$-0.143\ 648\ 198\ 373\ 887\ 496\ 043 \cdot 10^{246}$
9	$0.659\ 514\ 281\ 085\ 804\ 565\ 498 \cdot 10^{249}$	$0.659\ 514\ 281\ 094\ 798\ 452\ 336 \cdot 10^{249}$
10	$-0.306\ 750\ 687\ 264\ 795\ 900\ 309 \cdot 10^{253}$	$-0.306\ 750\ 687\ 281\ 012\ 588\ 650 \cdot 10^{253}$
11	$0.144\ 514\ 693\ 689\ 642\ 646\ 364 \cdot 10^{257}$	$0.144\ 514\ 693\ 716\ 909\ 093\ 737 \cdot 10^{257}$
12	$-0.689\ 498\ 329\ 409\ 437\ 387\ 151 \cdot 10^{260}$	$-0.689\ 498\ 329\ 840\ 371\ 816\ 155 \cdot 10^{260}$
13	$0.333\ 104\ 548\ 293\ 054\ 144\ 923 \cdot 10^{264}$	$0.333\ 104\ 548\ 937\ 521\ 023\ 558 \cdot 10^{264}$
14	$-0.162\ 924\ 769\ 352\ 053\ 020\ 131 \cdot 10^{268}$	$-0.162\ 924\ 770\ 269\ 205\ 895\ 837 \cdot 10^{268}$
15	$0.806\ 654\ 532\ 549\ 091\ 198\ 441 \cdot 10^{271}$	$0.806\ 654\ 545\ 029\ 445\ 531\ 410 \cdot 10^{271}$

The results in Table 3 show that the expansion coefficients $b_\nu^{(0,66)}$ with $\nu \geq 0$ provide already remarkably accurate predictions to the corresponding coefficients $b_{\nu+68}$. Moreover, the Stieltjes inequality (36) is satisfied in all cases.

In Table 4 we do the same calculations as in Table 3, but this time for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ of the quartic anharmonic oscillator. Thus, the expansion of the rational function $\varphi_{66}^{(0)}(\beta)$, which is computed from the coefficients $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ with $1 \leq \nu \leq 67$ of the perturbation series (29), provides predictions $\mathcal{B}_\nu^{(0,66)}$ to the coefficients $\mathcal{B}_{\nu+68}$.

A comparison of Tables 3 and 4 shows that their qualitative features are identical. In this context it is quite remarkable that although the coefficients b_n grow significantly more rapidly in magnitude than the coefficients $\mathcal{B}_n$, which follows from the large-order estimates (3) and (6), Padé prediction nevertheless yields results of virtually identical quality.

The Padé prediction of unknown series coefficients based on the recursive scheme (38) is certainly computationally simpler than the straightforward symbolic computation and expansion of Padé approximants. The rational function $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ has a simpler structure than $\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)} = P_k^{k+n}(z)$, and the first $n + 2k$ symbolic differentiations can be avoided. Nevertheless, the recursive symbolic computation of the rational function $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ from the coefficients $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n+2k}$ of the power series (10) can become quite demanding, in particular if k

Table 4: Predictions $\mathcal{B}_n^{(0,66)}$ for the coefficients $\mathcal{B}_{n+66}$ of the perturbation series (29) for $\Delta E_0(\beta)$ with $0 \leq n \leq 15$.

n	$\mathcal{B}_n^{(0,66)}$	$\mathcal{B}_{n+68}$
0	$-0.243\,941\,384\,991\,118\,295\,771 \cdot 10^{108}$	$-0.243\,941\,384\,991\,118\,295\,782 \cdot 10^{108}$
1	$0.250\,725\,042\,695\,070\,353\,544 \cdot 10^{110}$	$0.250\,725\,042\,695\,070\,353\,955 \cdot 10^{110}$
2	$-0.261\,457\,030\,278\,874\,510\,535 \cdot 10^{112}$	$-0.261\,457\,030\,278\,874\,517\,978 \cdot 10^{112}$
3	$0.276\,569\,040\,522\,183\,341\,803 \cdot 10^{114}$	$0.276\,569\,040\,522\,183\,434\,367 \cdot 10^{114}$
4	$-0.296\,701\,814\,375\,736\,021\,569 \cdot 10^{116}$	$-0.296\,701\,814\,375\,736\,909\,442 \cdot 10^{116}$
5	$0.322\,749\,390\,515\,363\,534\,568 \cdot 10^{118}$	$0.322\,749\,390\,515\,370\,538\,244 \cdot 10^{118}$
6	$-0.355\,923\,577\,678\,312\,610\,650 \cdot 10^{120}$	$-0.355\,923\,577\,678\,359\,918\,630 \cdot 10^{120}$
7	$0.397\,845\,013\,388\,761\,856\,087 \cdot 10^{122}$	$0.397\,845\,013\,389\,043\,208\,304 \cdot 10^{122}$
8	$-0.450\,670\,140\,529\,734\,425\,361 \cdot 10^{124}$	$-0.450\,670\,140\,531\,237\,820\,183 \cdot 10^{124}$
9	$0.517\,267\,603\,130\,982\,724\,472 \cdot 10^{126}$	$0.517\,267\,603\,138\,312\,496\,560 \cdot 10^{126}$
10	$-0.601\,463\,530\,952\,366\,420\,452 \cdot 10^{128}$	$-0.601\,463\,530\,985\,369\,171\,801 \cdot 10^{128}$
11	$0.708\,383\,831\,448\,709\,420\,419 \cdot 10^{130}$	$0.708\,383\,831\,587\,280\,706\,922 \cdot 10^{130}$
12	$-0.844\,934\,259\,800\,460\,726\,512 \cdot 10^{132}$	$-0.844\,934\,260\,347\,380\,950\,714 \cdot 10^{132}$
13	$0.102\,047\,769\,191\,033\,928\,036 \cdot 10^{135}$	$0.102\,047\,769\,395\,298\,233\,145 \cdot 10^{135}$
14	$-0.124\,779\,572\,617\,585\,209\,351 \cdot 10^{137}$	$-0.124\,779\,573\,343\,562\,971\,244 \cdot 10^{137}$
15	$0.154\,446\,315\,576\,951\,606\,777 \cdot 10^{139}$	$0.154\,446\,318\,044\,174\,985\,350 \cdot 10^{139}$

becomes large.

The problems connected with the computation of $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ can largely be avoided if one only tries to compute a prediction

$$g_{2k}^{(n)} = g_0^{(n,2k)} \quad (43)$$

for the *first* term γ_{n+2k+1} not used for the construction of either $\varepsilon_{2k}^{(n)}$ or $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$. For that purpose, we have only to set $z = 0$ in (38). This yields the following recursive scheme (Eq. (3.17) of [31]):

$$g_0^{(n)} = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (44a)$$

$$g_2^{(n)} = \frac{[\gamma_{n+2}]^2}{\gamma_{n+1}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (44b)$$

$$g_{2k+2}^{(n)} = g_{2k}^{(n+2)} + \frac{[\gamma_{n+2k+2} - g_{2k}^{(n+1)}]^2}{\gamma_{n+2k+1} - g_{2k}^{(n)}} - \frac{[\gamma_{n+2k+2} - g_{2k}^{(n+1)}]^2}{\gamma_{n+2k+1} - g_{2k-2}^{(n+2)}}, \quad (44c)$$

$$k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The main advantage of this recursive scheme over the recursive scheme (38), from which it was derived, is that it only involves numbers but no symbolic expressions.

In Table 5 we present selected results for the Padé predictions of the *first* coefficients of the perturbation expansion (28) for $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ and (29) for $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$, which were not used in the Padé approximants $\varepsilon_{2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{(n-2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket)} = P_{\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{n-\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}$ for $2 \leq n \leq 191$. The first predictions $b_0^{(n-2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket, 2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket)}$ to b_{n+2} and $\mathcal{B}_0^{(n-2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket, 2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket)}$ to $\mathcal{B}_{n+2}$ were computed with the help of the

Table 5: Relative errors R_n and $\mathcal{R}_n$ defined in (45) and (46) of the Padé predictions for the first coefficients of the perturbation series (28) and (29) not used for the construction of the rational approximants.

n	R_n	$\mathcal{R}_n$
2	-0.295 410 699	-0.316 117 394
3	-0.207 610 910	-0.218 823 682
4	-0.759 683 860 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-0.833 341 229 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
5	-0.483 909 816 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-0.522 231 970 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
6	-0.197 254 000 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-0.218 362 310 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
7	-0.120 176 754 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-0.130 908 858 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
50	-0.258 379 657 $\cdot 10^{-14}$	-0.273 374 025 $\cdot 10^{-14}$
51	-0.134 007 443 $\cdot 10^{-14}$	-0.141 313 446 $\cdot 10^{-14}$
52	-0.658 949 507 $\cdot 10^{-15}$	-0.696 514 376 $\cdot 10^{-15}$
53	-0.341 294 856 $\cdot 10^{-15}$	-0.359 600 798 $\cdot 10^{-15}$
54	-0.167 932 626 $\cdot 10^{-15}$	-0.177 342 673 $\cdot 10^{-15}$
100	-0.327 674 717 $\cdot 10^{-29}$	-0.341 449 758 $\cdot 10^{-29}$
101	-0.166 900 610 $\cdot 10^{-29}$	-0.173 636 626 $\cdot 10^{-29}$
102	-0.827 630 688 $\cdot 10^{-30}$	-0.862 097 827 $\cdot 10^{-30}$
103	-0.421 400 183 $\cdot 10^{-30}$	-0.438 256 801 $\cdot 10^{-30}$
104	-0.208 999 229 $\cdot 10^{-30}$	-0.217 623 211 $\cdot 10^{-30}$
140	-0.354 821 178 $\cdot 10^{-41}$	-0.367 523 224 $\cdot 10^{-41}$
141	-0.179 775 658 $\cdot 10^{-41}$	-0.186 000 741 $\cdot 10^{-41}$
142	-0.893 606 384 $\cdot 10^{-42}$	-0.925 378 776 $\cdot 10^{-42}$
143	-0.452 675 070 $\cdot 10^{-42}$	-0.468 247 723 $\cdot 10^{-42}$
144	-0.225 028 932 $\cdot 10^{-42}$	-0.232 976 269 $\cdot 10^{-42}$
187	-0.295 089 701 $\cdot 10^{-55}$	-0.304 045 084 $\cdot 10^{-55}$
188	-0.146 895 157 $\cdot 10^{-55}$	-0.151 456 461 $\cdot 10^{-55}$
189	-0.741 750 230 $\cdot 10^{-56}$	-0.764 148 505 $\cdot 10^{-56}$
190	-0.369 259 543 $\cdot 10^{-56}$	-0.380 666 936 $\cdot 10^{-56}$
191	-0.186 438 979 $\cdot 10^{-56}$	-0.192 040 968 $\cdot 10^{-56}$

recursive scheme (44). For the sake of readability, we present in Table 5 only the relative errors

$$R_n = \frac{b_0^{(n-2\llbracket n/2\rrbracket, 2\llbracket n/2\rrbracket)} - b_{n+2}}{b_{n+2}} \quad (45)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_n = \frac{\mathcal{B}_0^{(n-2\llbracket n/2\rrbracket, 2\llbracket n/2\rrbracket)} - \mathcal{B}_{n+2}}{\mathcal{B}_{n+2}}. \quad (46)$$

If the input data of the recursive scheme (44) are exact rational numbers as the coefficients b_n or $\mathcal{B}_n$, then the predictions can be computed free of rounding errors. However, it turned

out that the predictions computed in this way were *huge* rational numbers which slowed down computation considerably. Therefore, we used the floating-point arithmetics of Maple with an accuracy of 600 decimal digits for the computation of results presented in Table 5.

The results in Table 5 show that the first coefficients not used for the construction of the Padé approximants $\varepsilon_{2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{(n-2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket)} = P_{\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{n-\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}$ can be predicted with remarkable accuracy by the recursive scheme (44) if n is sufficiently large. Moreover, the agreement of the relative errors R_n and $\mathcal{R}_n$ is stunning. However, for our purposes most important is the observation that all relative errors in Table 5 are negative which is in agreement with the Stieltjes inequality (36).

Thus, the prediction results of this section show that there is no significant difference between the prediction of coefficients b_n of the perturbation series (28), whose Stieltjes nature we want to establish, and the prediction of the coefficients $\mathcal{B}_n$ of the analogous quartic anharmonic oscillator perturbation series (29), whose Stieltjes nature was established rigorously by Simon (Theorem IV.2.1 of [28]). Accordingly, these results provide further numerical evidence that the perturbation series (28) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ is indeed a Stieltjes series.

5 Summary and Conclusions

As shown by countless monographs or articles, the mathematical theory of the conventional Hermitian Hamiltonians of quantum mechanics is well established and has reached a high degree of sophistication. Moreover, the divergence and the summation of the perturbation expansions resulting from these Hamiltonians is also comparatively well understood, in particular in the case of the Padé summation of Stieltjes series. In contrast, the rigorous mathematical theory of non-Hermitian, $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians is virtually nonexistent. It is not known whether divergent perturbation expansions resulting from such Hamiltonians can be summed to yield a uniquely determined result. Consequently, the best we can do for the moment is to perform numerical studies from which we can try to draw general qualitative conclusions.

The main intention of this paper is to provide numerical evidence that the perturbation series (28) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ is a Stieltjes series, because this would guarantee that certain subsequences of the Padé table constructed from the partial sums of this perturbation series converge to a uniquely determined summation result, as discussed in Section 2.

If the Padé approximants are computed with the help of Wynn's recursive algorithm (13) according to (15) and (17) – as it is done in this paper – and if the series to be transformed is the moment expansion of a Stieltjes function, then the Padé approximants must satisfy inequality (27). As shown in Table 2, the Padé summation results for the perturbation series (28) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ as well as for the analogous perturbation series (29) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta \mathcal{E}_0(\beta)$ of the quartic anharmonic oscillator, which is known to be a Stieltjes series, satisfy this inequality. Moreover, the divergence of the two perturbation expansions (28) and (29) as well as the convergence of their Padé summation results is virtually indistinguishable if the two coupling constants λ and β satisfy (7).

If a Padé approximant $P_m^l(z)$ constructed from the partial sums (22) of the moment expansion for a Stieltjes function $F(z)$ is expanded in power series around $z = 0$ according to (35), then this series must be strictly alternating for $z > 0$ just like the Stieltjes series for $F(z)$. Moreover, the coefficients $\mu_n^{[l/m]}$ of this expansion are bounded in magnitude by the Stieltjes moments μ_n according to the inequality (36).

Thus, via the inequality (36) it can be checked whether a moment expansion of the type of (20) is a Stieltjes series. However, the accuracy-through-order relationship (12)

implies that this inequality is by default satisfied for all indices $n \leq l + m$, and only for $n \geq l + m + 1$ do we obtain useful information. In particular for large values of l and m , the symbolic construction of Padé approximants and their subsequent expansion may become quite demanding both with respect to time and memory.

These computational problems can to some extent be overcome by expressing the Padé approximants $P_k^{k+n}(z)$, that can be computed with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm, according to (37) by the partial sum from which it was constructed plus the transformation term $z^{n+2k+1}\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$. The quantities $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ can be computed recursively with the help of (38), and their computation is less demanding than the recursive computation of the corresponding Padé approximants $P_k^{k+n}(z)$. Moreover, the Taylor expansion of $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ according to (40) yields the desired coefficients $\mu_{n+2k+\nu+1}^{[k+n/k]}$ with $\nu \geq 0$.

In Tables 3 and 4, we proceed as described above and confirm the validity of the Stieltjes inequality (36) in the case of the first 15 coefficients of the quantities $\varphi_{66}^{(0)}(\lambda^2)$ and $\varphi_{66}^{(0)}(\beta)$ corresponding to the Padé approximants $P_{33}^{33}(\lambda^2)$ and $P_{33}^{33}(\beta)$, respectively. In this context, it is remarkable that the quality of the predictions is virtually indistinguishable although the coefficients b_n of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric perturbation series grow much more rapidly than the coefficients $\mathcal{B}_n$ for the quartic anharmonic oscillator.

For larger values of n and k the symbolic computation of the quantities $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$ via the recursive scheme (38) becomes quite demanding. In such a case, it is much simpler to compute only the prediction for the first series coefficient not used for the computation of $\varphi_{2k}^{(n)}(z)$. This can be done with the help of the recursive scheme (44). In Table 5 we show that all first predictions, which we can compute from the coefficients b_ν and $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ with $1 \leq \nu \leq 192$, satisfy the Stieltjes inequality (36). Moreover, the quality of the prediction results is again virtually identical.

We are of course aware that numerical results cannot replace rigorous mathematical proofs. Nevertheless, we believe that our numerical experiments are both interesting and useful, and that they provide considerable evidence that the perturbation series (28) for the ground-state energy shift $\Delta E_0(\lambda^2)$ of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (1) is indeed a Stieltjes series, which would imply that the Padé summation of this divergent perturbation series converges.

Acknowledgment

CMB is grateful to the U.S. Department of Energy for financial support and EJW thanks the Fonds der Chemischen Industrie for financial support.

References

- [1] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5243 (1998).
- [2] C. M. Bender, S. Boettcher, and P. N. Meisinger, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 2201 (1999).
- [3] C. M. Bender and K. A. Milton, Phys. Rev. D **55**, R3255 (1997).
- [4] C. M. Bender and K. A. Milton, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 3595 (1998).
- [5] C. M. Bender and K. A. Milton, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **32**, L87, (1999).
- [6] C. M. Bender and H. F. Jones, Foundations of Physics **30**, 393-412 (2000).
- [7] C. M. Bender, K. A. Milton, and V. M. Savage, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 085001 (2000).

- [8] P. Dorey and R. Tatao, “On the Relation between Stokes Multipliers and the T - Q Systems of Conformal Field Theory,” University of Durham preprint, 1999.
- [9] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **31** L273 (1998).
- [10] C. M. Bender, F. Cooper, P. N. Meisinger, and V. M. Savage, Phys. Lett. A **259**, 224, (1999).
- [11] C. M. Bender, S. Boettcher, H. F. Jones, and V. M. Savage, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **32**, 6771 (1999).
- [12] C. M. Bender, G. V. Dunne and P. N. Meisinger, Phys. Lett. A **252**, 272 (1999).
- [13] A. A. Andrianov, M. V. Ioffe, F. Cannata, J.-P. Dedonder, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **14**, 2675 (1999).
- [14] E. Delabaere and F. Pham, Phys. Lett. A **250**, 25 (1998); **250**, 29 (1998).
- [15] E. Delabaere and D. T. Trinh, “Spectral Analysis of the Complex Cubic Oscillator,” University of Nice preprint, 1999.
- [16] M. Znojil, J. Phys. A **33**, L61 (2000).
- [17] B. Bagchi and R. Roychoudhury, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, L1 (2000).
- [18] F. Cannata, G. Junker, J. Trost, “Remarks on Complex Potentials Generating Real Spectra,” University of Bologna preprint, 1998.
- [19] H. Jones, “The Energy Spectrum of Complex Periodic Potentials of the Kronig-Penney Type,” Imperial College preprint, 1999.
- [20] C. M. Bender and G. V. Dunne, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 4616, (1999).
- [21] C. A. Hurst, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **48**, 635 (1952); W. Thirring, Helv. Phys. Acta **26**, 33 (1953).
- [22] C. M. Bender and T. T. Wu, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1231 (1969); Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 461 (1971); Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1620 (1973).
- [23] J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin (Eds.), *Large-Order Behaviour of Perturbation Theory*, (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1990).
- [24] E. Borel, *Leçons sur les Séries Divergentes*, 2nd edition (Gautier-Villars, Paris, 1928). Reprinted by Éditions Jacques Gabay, Paris, 1988. Translated by C. L. Critchfield and A. Vakar, *Lectures on Divergent Series* (Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Translation LA-6140-TR, 1975).
- [25] G. Hardy, *Divergent Series* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1949).
- [26] C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1978).
- [27] B. Shawyer and B. Watson, *Borel’s Method of Summability* (Oxford U.P., Oxford, 1994).
- [28] B. Simon, Ann. Phys. **45**, 76 (1970).
- [29] I. Herbst and B. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41**, 67 (1978).
- [30] E. J. Weniger, J. Čížek, and F. Vinette, J. Math. Phys. **34**, 571 (1993).

- [31] E. J. Weniger, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **122**, 329 (2000). This special millennium issue (Vol. **122**) of Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics (edited by C. Brezinski) will also be printed as Vol. II *Interpolation and Extrapolation* of the seven-volume set *Numerical Analysis 2000* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2000).
- [32] E. J. Weniger, Comput. Phys. Rep. **10**, 189 (1989).
- [33] E. J. Weniger, Ann. Phys. (NY) **246**, 133 (1996).
- [34] E. J. Weniger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2859 (1996).
- [35] P. Wynn, Math. Tables Aids Comput. **10**, 91 (1956).
- [36] C. Brezinski, *A Bibliography on Continued Fractions, Padé Approximation, Extrapolation and Related Subjects* (Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, 1991).
- [37] G. A. Baker, Jr., Adv. Theor. Phys. **1**, 1 (1965).
- [38] G. A. Baker, Jr., *Essentials of Padé Approximants* (Academic Press, New York, 1975).
- [39] G. A. Baker, Jr., and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants*, 2nd edition (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [40] H. S. Wall, *Analytic Theory of Continued Fractions*, (Chelsea, New York, 1973).
- [41] W. B. Jones and W. T. Thron, *Continued Fractions* (Addison Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1980).
- [42] K. O. Bowman and L. R. Shenton, *Continued Fractions in Statistical Applications* (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1989).
- [43] L. Lorentzen and H. Waadeland, *Continued Fractions with Applications* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992).
- [44] G. A. Baker, Jr., *Quantitative Theory of Critical Phenomena* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1990).
- [45] A. Pozzi, *Applications of Padé Approximation Theory in Fluid Dynamics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).
- [46] C. Brezinski, *History of Continued Fractions and Padé Approximants* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
- [47] C. Brezinski, Appl. Numer. Math. **20**, 299 (1996).
- [48] C. Brezinski, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **122**, 1 (2000). This special millennium issue (Vol. **122**) of Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics (edited by C. Brezinski) will also be printed as Vol. II *Interpolation and Extrapolation* of the seven-volume set *Numerical Analysis 2000* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2000).
- [49] A. Cuyt and L. Wuytack, *Nonlinear Methods in Numerical Analysis* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987).
- [50] C. Brezinski, *Accélération de la Convergence en Analyse Numérique*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1977).

- [51] P. R. Graves-Morris, D. E. Roberts, and A. Salam, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **122**, 51 (2000). This special millennium issue (Vol. **122**) of Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics (edited by C. Brezinski) will also be printed as Vol. II *Interpolation and Extrapolation* of the seven-volume set *Numerical Analysis 2000* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2000).
- [52] S. Graffi and V. Grecchi, J. Math. Phys. **19**, 1002 (1978).
- [53] J. Gilewicz, in *Padé Approximants and Their Applications*, edited by P. R. Graves-Morris (Academic Press, London, 1973), p. 99.
- [54] M. A. Samuel, G. Li, and E. Steinfelds, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 869 (1993).
- [55] M. A. Samuel and G. Li, Phys. Lett. B **331**, 114 (1994).
- [56] M. A. Samuel, G. Li, and E. Steinfelds, Phys. Lett. B **323**, 188 (1994).
- [57] M. A. Samuel, J. Ellis, and M. Karliner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4380 (1995).
- [58] M. A. Samuel, G. Li, and E. Steinfelds, Phys. Rev. E **51**, 3911 (1995); Erratum, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 2072 (1997).
- [59] J. Ellis, E. Gardi, M. Karliner, and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Lett. B **366**, 268 (1996).
- [60] J. Ellis, E. Gardi, M. Karliner, and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 6986 (1996).
- [61] E. J. Weniger, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 5165 (1997).
- [62] M. A. Samuel, T. Abraha, and J. Yu, Phys. Lett. B **394**, 165 (1997).
- [63] I. Jack, D. R. T. Jones, and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Lett. B **407**, 143 (1997).
- [64] J. Ellis, I. Jack, D. R. T. Jones, M. Karliner, and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 2665 (1998).
- [65] V. Elias, T. G. Steele, F. Chishtie, R. Migneron, and K. Sprague, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116007 (1998).
- [66] T. G. Steele and V. Elias, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13**, 3151 (1998).
- [67] F. Chishtie, V. Elias, and T. G. Steele, Phys. Lett. B **446**, 267 (1999).
- [68] F. Chishtie, V. Elias, and T. G. Steele, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 105013 (1999).
- [69] F. Chishtie, V. Elias, and T. G. Steele, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **26**, 93 (2000).
- [70] F. Chishtie, V. Elias, and T. G. Steele, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **26**, 1239 (2000).
- [71] U. Jentschura, J. Becher, E. J. Weniger, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2446 (2000).
- [72] U. Jentschura, E. J. Weniger, and G. Soff, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **26**, 1545 (2000).